

# **The State of Mississippi's Public Water System Capacity Development Program**

## **A Report to the Governor**

---

**Submitted to**

**Governor Ronnie Musgrove**

**Submitted by**

**Mississippi State Department of Health**

**September 2002**



# **The State of Mississippi's Public Water System Capacity Development Program**

## **A Report to the Governor**

---

**Submitted to**

**Governor Ronnie Musgrove**

**Submitted by**

**Mississippi State Department of Health**

**September 2002**

This page intentionally left blank

# **The State of Mississippi's Public Water System Capacity Development Program - A Report to the Governor**

## **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

The Federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to states to implement a Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund (DWSRF) Program. States are required to provide 20% in matching state funds to qualify to receive these grants. This DWSRF Program is designed to provide low cost loans to public water systems to undertake construction projects necessary to enable the public water systems to comply with the requirements of the SDWA thereby ensuring safe and adequate drinking water to their customers. Federal law defines public water systems as systems serving 15 connections or 25 or more people on a daily basis for at least six months out of the year. In Mississippi, the DWSRF Program has been placed under the Local Governments and Rural Water Systems Improvements Board. This Board is composed of the heads of the following state agencies - Mississippi Development Authority, Department of Finance and Administration, Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Health; the executive director of the Mississippi Association of Supervisors, the executive director of the Consulting Engineers' Council, the executive director of the Mississippi Municipal League, the executive director of the Mississippi office of the USDA-Rural Utility Service, and a manager of a rural water association appointed by the Governor. With the exception of the manager of a rural water association, each of these individuals may appoint an authorized representative to serve on this Board. The executive director of the Department of Health or his designee serves, by statute, as the chairman of this board and the Department of Health is required to provide administrative support to the Board. The Board currently contracts with the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality to handle the day-to-day activities required to make loans to public water systems. The Department of Health's staff provides the overall coordination of the program. The FY 2001 DWSRF grant award to Mississippi was \$9,047,400. In FY 2001, 27 public water system projects totaling \$10,790,191 were funded through loans under this program.

The SDWA requires that each state, in order to qualify to receive funds under the DWSRF Program, develop and implement a Public Water System Capacity Development (CD) Program. Capacity of a public water system, as defined by the SDWA, includes much more than the number of customers the system can serve or the quantity of water that the system can deliver. Capacity of a public water system, as defined by the SDWA, includes a total evaluation of a water system's technical, managerial, and financial ability to routinely provide safe drinking water to its customers by complying with all requirements of all state and federal laws and regulations. The basic purpose of each state's CD program is to improve the technical, managerial, and financial capacity of the state's public water systems. The Department of Health has developed and implemented an EPA-approved CD program for public water systems - new water systems as well as existing water systems. The new water system part of this program has been in effect since July 1997 and the Capacity Assessment Rating Program for existing water systems was begun, in a limited manner, in July 2000 although a complete set of capacity assessment ratings was not completed until FY 2002. In order

to be eligible to continue to receive federal grant funds to support their DWSRF programs, the SDWA requires that each state submit a Public Water System Capacity Development Program Report to the Governor by 30 September 2002 and every three years thereafter. If a state fails to submit this report to the Governor, the SDWA authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce the state's future annual DWSRF Program grant awards by 20%.

The purpose of this document is to comply with this CD program mandatory reporting requirement. Specifically, Section 1420(c)(3) of the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act requires that *"not later than two years after the date on which a State first adopts a capacity development strategy.....and every three years thereafter, the head of the State agency.....shall submit to the Governor a report that shall also be available to the public on the efficacy of the strategy and progress made toward improving the technical, managerial and financial capacity of public water systems in the State."*

### **MISSISSIPPI'S CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR NEW PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS**

To comply with the public water system capacity development requirements of the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act, the Mississippi Legislature, during the 1997 session, revised the Mississippi Safe Drinking Water Law (MS SDWL) (Section 41-26-8, MS Code of 1972 Annotated). The revised MS SDWL now requires that all new community and non-transient non-community public water systems be approved by the Mississippi State Department of Health prior to beginning construction. This statute requires that all new public water systems be designed by a consulting engineer licensed to practice in Mississippi and that the engineering plans and specifications for the new water system be submitted to the MSDH for approval. The MSDH is required, during the review process for new public water systems, to ensure that the proposed new water system has the technical and operational capacity to comply with all current and proposed SDWA requirements. In addition, this statute prohibits the MSDH from approving new public water systems until written certification is received from the executive director of the Public Utility Staff that the new public water system also has the managerial and financial capacity to comply with all current and proposed SDWA requirements.

### **MISSISSIPPI'S CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR EXISTING PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS**

The implementation of an effective capacity development program for existing public water systems is a much more difficult task than implementing a program for new public water systems. The State of Mississippi has approximately 1430 public water systems that must comply with the requirements of the Federal and Mississippi Safe Drinking Water Acts and the vast majority of these systems are small with very limited financial capacity. Due to this limited financial capacity, it was impossible to develop a mandatory program that would force these small systems to immediately make the capital improvements necessary to have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to comply with the SDWA. The method chosen by the MSDH to improve the capacity of existing public water systems consists basically of two components: 1) Stringent enforcement of applicable laws and regulations and 2) Implementation of a capacity assessment rating program that is conducted by the

agency's regional engineers as part of annual sanitary surveys of these public water systems.

### **Enforcement of Laws and Regulations**

Laws and regulations related to the following key areas are the principal legal tools used by the MSDH to ensure that existing public water systems have the capacity to provide safe and adequate drinking water to their customers: 1) SDWA water quality standards - systems without adequate capacity are not able to make needed capital improvements to comply with these water quality standards, 2) Mississippi waterworks operator licensure law (Sections 21-27-201 thru 21-27-221, MS Code of 1972 Annotated) - this law requires that all water systems be operated by an individual licensed by the MSDH - systems without adequate capacity often find it difficult to employ a licensed waterworks operator, 3) Overloaded water systems (defined as water systems serving more customers than the MSDH approved design capacity) - MSDH regulations prohibit overloaded water systems from adding additional customers until the system is no longer overloaded, 4) Mandatory proper operation of corrosion control treatment facilities - State law (Section 41-26-8, MS Code of 1972 Annotated) requires public water systems that provide corrosion control treatment to properly operate the treatment facilities - systems with capacity problems often are financially unable to properly operate these treatment facilities; 5) Mandatory training for water system board members - State law (Section 41-26-101, MS Code of 1972 Annotated) requires that all members of the governing board of non-profit water systems and the board members of municipalities serving a population under 2,500 are required to attend an MSDH approved 8-hour training program - this training is very beneficial to board members who, in most cases, are totally unfamiliar with applicable laws and regulations.

The stringent enforcement of these laws and regulations strongly encourages public water systems with limited capacity to seek alternative methods to comply with these laws and regulations. When the owners/officials of these water systems realize that they cannot comply with these laws and regulations thereby ensuring that safe and adequate drinking water is provided to their customers, they invariably seek to merge with nearby viable water systems. These mergers, in almost all cases, result in the creation of much more capable public water systems that do have the capacity to provide safe and adequate drinking water to their customers.

### **Capacity Assessment Rating Program**

The other key component of the MSDH's capacity development program for existing public water systems is the Capacity Assessment Rating Program. Under this program, each public water system is rated annually during sanitary surveys conducted by the agency's regional engineers. The maximum rating possible under this rating system is "5.0" and the minimum possible rating is "0.0." The annual rating for a public water system is determined using a capacity assessment rating form developed by the MSDH working with an advisory committee. This advisory committee consists of representatives of organizations such as the Mississippi Municipal League, the Mississippi Rural Water Association, the Community Resources Group, and the Mississippi Water & Pollution Control Operators' Association as well as representative water system officials and operators from throughout the State of Mississippi. This committee meets on an annual basis (typically in April) to review the status of the Capacity Assessment Rating Program and to make recommendations to the MSDH where improvements or changes are needed for the coming fiscal year.

One of the most important activities of the advisory committee is to develop the rating questions that will be included on the next year's capacity assessment rating form. This rating form is broken into three major sections: 1) Technical Capacity, 2) Managerial Capacity, and 3) Financial Capacity. Key questions are included in each of these major areas. These key questions are designed to identify those things that a public water system must routinely do in order to have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to comply with all current and proposed requirements of the Federal and Mississippi Safe Drinking Water Acts. Three separate capacity rating forms are used by the agency's regional engineers: 1) Standard Form - this form is used for community public water systems that are not privately owned; 2) Private Form - this form is used for community public water systems that are privately/investor owned; 3) Non-transient Non-community Form - this form is used for those public water systems that serve the same individuals day-in and day-out on a non-resident basis - examples are schools and industries. Copies of the fiscal year 2002 and 2003 rating forms are included with this report at Attachment A. A summary report of the FY 2002 capacity rating of the State's public water systems is also included with this report at Attachment B.

### **CAPACITY ASSESSMENT RATINGS - HOW ARE THEY USED?**

The public water system capacity assessment ratings provide a very effective tool for determining those public water systems that are "at risk" of not being able to provide safe and adequate drinking water to their customers. This rating system has been of tremendous benefit in that it allows the agency's regional engineers to target their technical assistance activities to those public water systems most in need of this assistance (i.e., those with very low capacity ratings). The agency also uses these ratings to identify those public water systems that will be offered technical assistance by contractors employed by the agency using set-aside funds available from the Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund program. Currently, agency contractors provide technical assistance to public water systems under the following programs: 1) Comprehensive technical assistance - the contractor is required to provide this assistance to at least 12 systems per year as identified by the agency using the most current capacity ratings; 2) Short term technical assistance - the contractor is required to provide this technical assistance to 36 water systems per calendar quarter as identified by the agency using the most current capacity ratings and 3) Peer Review Program - the contractor is required to conduct a minimum of 12 peer reviews per year - water systems volunteer to undergo these peer reviews with preference being given to those systems with low capacity ratings - volunteer managers and operators conduct these peer reviews and results of peer reviews are kept confidential (state and federal agencies are never provided the names of systems that are participating in peer reviews).

### **EFFICACY OF MISSISSIPPI'S PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

It is very apparent that Mississippi's public water system capacity development program is having an effect in improving the capacity of the State's 1430 public water systems. State law now requires that new public water systems demonstrate that they have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to comply with the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Acts and provide safe and adequate drinking water to their customers. This new requirement will obviously ensure that only viable public water systems will now be constructed in the State of Mississippi. The Department



of Health and the Public Utility Staff are committed to making every effort to consistently apply the standards used to ensure that new public water systems have the required capacity. Both agencies are committed to making any necessary improvements to these standards to ensure the long term effectiveness of the capacity development program for new water systems.

The capacity assessment rating program has already resulted in a significant “change in attitude” among most of the officials and operators of the State’s public water systems. This rating system provides these officials with a benchmarking process that they can easily use to determine if they are properly managing and operating their water systems. The vast majority of these officials are now committed to making the necessary changes to improve their annual capacity ratings with the ultimate goal of routinely achieving the top rating of “5.0.”

The MSDH is also encouraging other state and federal agencies to begin using these capacity ratings in carrying out their legal responsibilities. As an example, the DWSRF Program in Mississippi is now using these capacity ratings as one of the assessment tools in determining who will receive loans under this program. Public water systems with very low capacity ratings and with little chance of improving this rating through the proposed loan are not considered as high priority loan applicants. The Department will also be encouraging other state and federal agencies as well as private organizations to use these capacity ratings in determining which water systems will be provided technical assistance. It is obvious that focusing all technical assistance activities in the State of Mississippi on those public water systems with the greatest need (i.e. low capacity ratings) will have a much greater impact on public water systems than providing technical assistance in a strictly random manner.

In addition to distributing a summary report of these ratings to all public water systems officials and operators, the Department plans to place this summary report on the agency’s web site so the ratings of all public water systems will be accessible to all customers of Mississippi’s public water systems as well as other interested parties. As customers become more aware of these ratings, the Department believes they will become more involved with the management of their water system and will encourage the system’s officials to make the needed changes to improve their annual capacity rating.

## **INDICATORS OF PROGRESS TOWARD IMPROVING THE TECHNICAL, MANAGERIAL AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY OF MISSISSIPPI’S PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS**

Although the Mississippi State Department of Health has only been implementing this Public Water System Capacity Development Program for a little over two years, it has already become apparent that this program is having a significant impact on how the State’s public water systems are being managed and operated. As an example of this impact, the average capacity rating score for FY 2002 was 3.15 and the average score for FY 2001 was 2.92. This reflects an increase of 7.9% in the average capacity rating in the first year of this program. This increase is much more significant when you take into account the fact that the FY 2002 Capacity Assessment Rating Form was more stringent than the Form used in FY 2001.

Another significant indicator that the State's Public Water System Capacity Development Program is having an impact is the merger of water systems with more viable neighboring water systems. During FY 2000, 15 public water systems were deleted from the water system inventory (i.e. merged with other water systems). During FY 2001, this number increased to 26 and during FY 2002, this number again increased to 35. In all these cases, the water systems resulting after the merger are larger and have more financial capacity to provide safe and adequate drinking water to their customers by complying with the Safe Drinking Water Acts.

With the Department now able to focus the technical assistance activities of their regional engineers and contractors on those public water systems most "at risk," this technical assistance will become much more effective and will result in a significant reduction in the number of public water systems that do not have the capacity to protect public health by providing safe and adequate drinking water to their customers

## **SUMMARY**

The State of Mississippi's Public Water System Capacity Development (CD) Program is now fully implemented. It is apparent that this CD program, by providing a benchmarking process for water system officials, is already having a significant impact on the management and operation of the state's public water systems. The State now has the legal process to prevent the formation of new non-viable public water systems. As more and more officials, operators, and customers become aware of the Department's Public Water System Capacity Rating Program, this program will continue to have an even greater impact on the capacity of the State's public water systems.

The Department is committed to implementing this Public Water System Capacity Development Program in a highly effective manner and is confident that this program will ultimately result in public water systems that have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to ensure safe and adequate drinking water to their customers by routinely complying with the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Acts.

# **Attachment A**

## **FY 2002 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Rating Forms**

This page intentionally left blank



PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ County: \_\_\_\_\_  
Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Waterworks Operator: \_\_\_\_\_.

Technical (T) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_] ■ Managerial (M) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_] ■ Financial (F) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_]

$$\text{Capacity Rating} = \frac{T + M + F}{3} = \frac{\quad}{3} = \underline{\quad}$$

**Overall Capacity Rating =** \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Regional Engineer

Date:        /        /

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Supervising Environmental Engineer

**Date:**        /        /

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Capacity Assessment		Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[T1]</b> 1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (i.e. Is pH, iron, free chlorine, etc. within acceptable range?) 2) Does the water system have an effective cross connection control program in compliance with MSDH regulations? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been cleaned, inspected, and painted (if needed) within the past 10 years? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> <u>NA</u> ] <b>(NOTE: All YESs or NAs required to received point)</b>		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	
<b>[T2]</b> Is water system overloaded? (i.e. serving customers in excess of MSDH approved design capacity)? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ]		Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____
<b>[T3]</b> 1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for the survey? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that AOA commitments were being met? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Was the water system properly maintained at time of survey? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 4) Did operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] <b>(NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)</b>		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[T4]</b> 1) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at time of survey (No significant deficiencies)? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] <b>(NOTE: Equipment deficiencies must be identified in survey report.)</b> 2) Does water system routinely track water loss and were acceptable water loss records available for review by the regional engineer? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Was a copy of this system's MSDH approved bacti site plan available for review during the survey and do bacti results clearly show this approved site plan is being used for all bacti monitoring? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] <b>(NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)</b>		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt	_____
<b>[T5]</b> Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing pressure problems in any part(s) of the distribution system? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (based on operator information, customer complaints, MSDH records, other information) <b>(NOTE: Must be documented on survey report)</b>		Y - 0 pt N - 1 pt	_____
<b>TECHNICAL CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>			

Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_

## Page 2 - FY 2002 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Management Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[M1]</b> Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M2]</b> 1) Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies and procedures available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] 2) Have all board members (at least 6 months), completed Board Member Training? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> <u>  NA  </u> ] 3) Does the Board of Directors meet monthly and were minutes of Board meetings available for review during the survey? (NOTE: Minimum quarterly, if system has an officially designated full time manager? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> <u>  NA  </u> ] (NOTE: All YESs or NAs required to receive point). NA - Not Applicable	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M3]</b> Has the water system had any SDWA violations in the past 24 months? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____
<b>[M4]</b> Has the water system developed a long range improvements plan and was this plan available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M5]</b> Does the water system have the ability to provide water during emergencies? (i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc.) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>MANAGEMENT CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>		

Financial Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[F1]</b> Does the system have a PSC issued certificated service area? (½ pt) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] Has the water system raised water rates in the past 5 years? (½ pt) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] (NOTE: Point may be awarded if the water system provides acceptable financial documentation clearly showing that a rate increase is not needed) (i.e. revenue has consistently exceeded expenditures by at least 10%, etc.)	1)Y- ½ pt 2)Y- ½ pt N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F2]</b> Does the water system have an officially adopted policy requiring that water rates be routinely reviewed and adjusted as appropriate and was this policy available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F3]</b> Does the water system routinely follow an officially adopted cut-off policy for customers who do not pay their water bills and was this policy made available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F4]</b> At the time of the survey, were 5 percent or less of the customers (active meters) of the water system delinquent in paying their water bills? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F5]:</b> Are annual financial reports routinely filed with Public Utility Staff and were copies of these reports available for review? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] Does the latest report show that system receipts exceed expenditures? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] (NOTE: Yes answer to both questions required to receive point)	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>FINANCIAL CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>		



**Division of Water Supply**  
**FY 2002 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form (FINAL)**

**Non-Transient Non-Community Systems**

**NOTE: This form must be completed whenever a routine sanitary survey of a public water system is conducted by a regional engineer of the Division of Water Supply.**

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Survey Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ County: \_\_\_\_\_

Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_

Certified Waterworks Operator: \_\_\_\_\_

**CAPACITY RATING DETERMINATION**

Technical (T) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☒ Managerial (M) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_]

Capacity Rating =  $\frac{T + M}{2}$  = \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall Capacity Rating = \_\_\_\_\_**

**Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
*Regional Engineer*

**Approved by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
*Supervising Environmental Engineer*

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Capacity Assessment		Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[T1]</b> 1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? [ Y N ] (i.e. Is pH, iron, free chlorine, etc. within acceptable range?) 2) Does the water system have an effective cross connection control program in compliance with MSDH regulations? [ Y N ] 3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been cleaned, inspected, and painted (if needed) within the past 10 years? [ Y N NA ] (NOTE: All YESs or NAs required to received point)		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[T2]</b> Is water system overloaded? (i.e. serving customers in excess of MSDH approved design capacity)? [ Y N ]		Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____
<b>[T3]</b> 1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for the survey? [ Y N ] 2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that AOA commitments were being met? [ Y N ] 3) Was water system well maintained at time of survey? [ Y N ] 4) Did operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? [ Y N ] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[T4]</b> 1) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at time of survey? (No significant deficiencies) [ Y N ] (NOTE: Equipment deficiencies must be identified in survey report.) 2) Does water system routinely track water production and were acceptable water usage records available for review by the regional engineer? [ Y N ] 3) Was a copy of this system's MSDH approved bacti site plan available for review during the survey and do bacti results clearly show this approved site plan is being used for all bacti monitoring? [ Y N ] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt	_____
<b>[T5]</b> Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing pressure problems in any part(s) of the distribution system? [ Y N ] (based on operator information, customer complaints, MSDH records, other information) (NOTE: Must be documented on survey report)		Y - 0 pt N - 1 pt	_____
<b>TECHNICAL CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>			

Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_  
Page 2 - FY 2002 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_  
Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Management Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[M1]</b> Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M2]</b> 1) Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies and procedures available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M3]</b> Has the water system had any SDWA violations in the past 24 months? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____
<b>[M4]</b> Has the water system developed a preventive maintenance schedule and was a copy of this schedule available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M5]</b> Does the water system have the ability to provide water during emergencies? ( i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc. ) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] NOTE: Schools may provide bottled water if included as part of a published emergency plan.	Y - 1 pt N - 0 pt	_____
<b>MANAGEMENT CAPACITY RATING = [            ] (total points)</b>		





**Division of Water Supply**  
**FY 2002 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form (FINAL)**

**STANDARD FORM**

**NOTE: This form must be completed whenever a routine sanitary survey of a public water system is conducted by a regional engineer of the Division of Water Supply.**

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ County: \_\_\_\_\_

Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_

Certified Waterworks Operator: \_\_\_\_\_

**CAPACITY RATING DETERMINATION**

Technical (T) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☐ Managerial (M) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☐ Financial (F) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☐

Capacity Rating =  $\frac{T + M + F}{3}$  = \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall Capacity Rating = \_\_\_\_\_**

**Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

*Regional Engineer*

**Approved by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

*Supervising Environmental Engineer*

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Technical Capacity Assessment</b>		<b>Point Scale</b>	<b>Point Award</b>
<b>[T1]</b> 1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (i.e. Is pH, iron, free chlorine, etc. within acceptable range?) 2) Does the water system have an effective cross connection control program in compliance with MSDH regulations? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been cleaned, inspected, and painted (if needed) within the past 10 years? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> <u>NA</u> ] (NOTE: All YESs or NAs required to receive point)		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T2]</b> Is water system overloaded? (i.e. serving customers in excess of MSDH approved design capacity)? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ]		Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T3]</b> 1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for the survey? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that AOA commitments were being met? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Was the water system properly maintained at time of survey? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 4) Did operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T4]</b> 1) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at time of survey (:no significant deficiencies)? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (NOTE: Equipment deficiencies must be identified in survey report.) 2) Does water system routinely track water loss and were acceptable water loss records available for review by the regional engineer? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Was a copy of this system's MSDH approved bacti site plan available for review during the survey and do bacti results clearly show this approved site plan is being used for all bacti monitoring? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)		All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T5]</b> Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing pressure problems in any part(s) of the distribution system? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (based on operator information, customer complaints, MSDH records, other information) (NOTE: Must be documented on survey report)		Y - 0 pt N - 1 pt	_____  _____
<b>TECHNICAL CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>			

Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_

Page 2 - FY 2002 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Management Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[M1]</b> Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M2]</b> 1) Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies and procedures available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] 2) Have all board members (at least 6 months), completed Board Member Training? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> <u>  NA  </u> ] 3) Does the Board of Directors meet monthly and were minutes of Board meetings available for review during the survey (NOTE: Minimum quarterly, if system has an officially designated full time manager? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> <u>  NA  </u> ] (NOTE: All YESs or NAs required to receive point). NA - Not Applicable	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M3]</b> Has the water system had any SDWA violations in the past 24 months? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____
<b>[M4]</b> Has the water system developed a long range improvements plan and was this plan available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M5]</b> Does the water system have the ability to provide water during emergencies? (i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc.) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>MANAGEMENT CAPACITY RATING = [            ] (total points)</b>		

Financial Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[F1]</b> Has the water system raised water rates in the past 5 years? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] (NOTE: Point may be awarded if the water system provides acceptable financial documentation clearly showing that a rate increase is not needed) (i.e. revenue has consistently exceeded expenditures by at least 10%, etc.)	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F2]</b> Does the water system have an officially adopted policy requiring that water rates be routinely reviewed and adjusted as appropriate and was this policy available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F3]</b> Does the water system routinely follow an officially adopted cut-off policy for customers who do not pay their water bills and was this policy made available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F4]</b> At the time of the survey, were 5 percent or less of the customers (active meters) of the water system delinquent in paying their water bills? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F5 - Municipal Systems]:</b> Is the municipality current in submitting audit reports to the State Auditor's Office? Was a copy of the latest audit report available for review at the time of the survey? Does this audit report clearly show that water and sewer fund account(s) are maintained separately from all other municipal accounts? NOTE: (Yes answer to all questions required to receive point.)	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F5 - Rural Systems]:</b> 1) Has the rural water system filed the required financial reports with State Auditor's Office and were these reports available for review? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] 2) Does the latest financial report show that receipts exceeded expenditures? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] (NOTE: Yes answer to both questions required to receive point)	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>FINANCIAL CAPACITY RATING = [            ] (total points)</b>		

**FY 2003**  
**Public Water System**  
**Capacity Assessment Rating**  
**Forms**

This page intentionally left blank



**Non-Transient Non-Community Systems**

**Division of Water Supply  
FY 2003 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form (FINAL)**

**NOTE: This form must be completed whenever a routine sanitary survey of a public water system is conducted by a regional engineer of the Division of Water Supply.**

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Survey Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ County: \_\_\_\_\_  
Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Waterworks Operator: \_\_\_\_\_ Pop: \_\_\_\_\_

**CAPACITY RATING DETERMINATION**

Technical (T) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☐ Managerial (M) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☐

Capacity Rating =  $\frac{T + M}{2} = \frac{\quad + \quad}{2} = \quad$

**Overall Capacity Rating = \_\_\_\_\_**

**Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
*Regional Engineer*  
**Approved by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
*Supervising Environmental Engineer*

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[T1]</b> 1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? [ Y N ] (i.e. Is pH, iron, free chlorine, etc. within acceptable range?) 2) Does the water system have an effective cross connection control program in compliance with MSDH regulations? [ Y N ] 3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been cleaned, inspected, and painted (if needed) within the past 10 years? [ Y N NA ] (NOTE: All YESs or NAs required to received point)	All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T2]</b> Is water system overloaded? (i.e. serving customers in excess of MSDH approved design capacity)? [ Y N ]	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____ _____
<b>[T3]</b> 1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for the survey? [ Y N ] 2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that AOA commitments were being met? [ Y N ] 3) Was water system well maintained at time of survey? [ Y N ] 4) Did operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? [ Y N ] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T4]</b> 1) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at time of survey? (No significant deficiencies/adequacy of security) [ Y N ] (NOTE: Equipment deficiencies must be identified in survey report.) 2) Does water system routinely track water production and were acceptable water production records available for review by the regional engineer? [ Y N ] 3) Was a copy of this system's MSDH approved bacti site plan and lead/copper plan available for review during the survey and do bacti results clearly show this approved site plan is being used for all bacti monitoring? [ Y N ] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T5]</b> Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing pressure problems in any part(s) of the distribution system? [ Y N ] (based on operator information, customer complaints, MSDH records, other information) (NOTE: Must be documented on survey report)	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____ _____
<b>TECHNICAL CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>		

Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_  
Page 2 - FY 2003 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_  
Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Management Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[M1] Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[M2] 1) Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies and procedures available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[M3] Has the water system had any SDWA violations in the past 24 months? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____
[M4] Has the water system developed a preventive maintenance schedule and was a copy of this schedule available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[M5] Does the water system have the ability to provide water during emergencies? ( i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc. ) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] NOTE: Systems may provide bottled water if included as part of a published emergency plan.	Y - 1 pt N - 0 pt	_____
MANAGEMENT CAPACITY RATING = [                      ] (total points)		

ver. 1July2002



Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Page 2 - FY 2003 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Management Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[M1] Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[M2] Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies and procedures available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[M3] Has the water system had any SDWA violations in the past 24 months? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____
[M4] Has the water system developed a long range improvements plan and was this plan available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[M5] Does the water system have the ability to provide water during emergencies? (i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc.) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>MANAGEMENT CAPACITY RATING = [            ] (total points)</b>		

Financial Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[F1] Does the water system have a PSC issued certificated service area? (½ pt) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] Has the water system raised rates in the past 5 years? (½ pt) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] (NOTE: Point may be awarded if the water system provides acceptable financial documentation clearly showing that a rate increase is not needed) (i.e. revenue has consistently exceeded expenditures by at least 10%, etc.)	1)Y-½pt 2)Y-½pt N - 0 pt	_____
[F2] Does the water system have an officially adopted policy requiring that water rates be routinely reviewed and adjusted as appropriate and was this policy available for review during the survey?[ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[F3] Does the water system have an officially adopted cut-off policy for customers who do not pay their water bills, was a copy of this policy available for review by the regional engineer, and do system records (cut-off lists, etc.) <u>clearly</u> show that the water system effectively implements this cut-off policy? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[F4] Was a copy of the water system's officially adopted annual budget available for review by the regional engineer and does the water system's financial accounting system clearly and accurately track the expenditure and receipt of funds? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
[F5]: Are annual financial reports routinely filed with the Public Utility Staff and were copies of these reports available for review by the regional engineer at the time of survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] Does the latest financial report show that system receipts exceed expenditures? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] (NOTE: Yes answer to both questions required to receive point)	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>FINANCIAL CAPACITY RATING = [            ] (total points)</b>		





**Division of Water Supply**  
**FY 2003 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form (FINAL)**

**STANDARD FORM**

**NOTE: This form must be completed whenever a routine sanitary survey of a public water system is conducted by a regional engineer of the Division of Water Supply.**

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ County: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_ # Conns.: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Certified Waterworks Operator: \_\_\_\_\_ Pop.: \_\_\_\_\_

**CAPACITY RATING DETERMINATION**

Technical (T) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☐ Managerial (M) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☐ Financial (F) Capacity Rating: [\_\_\_\_\_] ☐

Capacity Rating =  $\frac{T + M + F}{3} = \frac{\quad + \quad + \quad}{3} = \quad$

**Overall Capacity Rating = \_\_\_\_\_**

<b>Completed by:</b> _____	<b>Date:</b> ____ / ____ / ____
<i>Regional Engineer</i>	
<b>Approved by:</b> _____	<b>Date:</b> ____ / ____ / ____
<i>Supervising Environmental Engineer</i>	

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[T1]</b> 1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (i.e. Is pH, iron, free chlorine, etc. within acceptable range?) 2) Does the water system have an effective cross connection control program in compliance with MSDH regulations? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been cleaned, inspected, and painted (if needed) within the past 10 years? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> <u>NA</u> ] (NOTE: All YESs or NAs required to receive point)	All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T2]</b> Is water system overloaded? (i.e. serving customers in excess of MSDH approved design capacity)? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ]	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T3]</b> 1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for the survey? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that AOA commitments were being met? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Was the water system properly maintained at time of survey? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 4) Did operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T4]</b> 1) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at time of survey (no significant deficiencies/adequacy of security)? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (NOTE: Equipment deficiencies must be identified in survey report.) 2) Does water system routinely track water loss and were acceptable water loss records available for review by the regional engineer? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] 3) Was a copy of this system's MSDH approved bacti site plan and lead/copper site plan available for review during the survey and do bacti results clearly show this approved site plan is being used for all bacti monitoring? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All YESs - 1 pt.  Any NOs - 0 pt.	_____  _____
<b>[T5]</b> Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing pressure problems in any part(s) of the distribution system? [ <u>Y</u> <u>N</u> ] (based on operator information, customer complaints, MSDH records, other information) (NOTE: Must be documented on survey report)	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____  _____
<b>TECHNICAL CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>		

Public Water System: \_\_\_\_\_

PWS ID #: \_\_\_\_\_

Page 2 - FY 2003 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

Survey Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Management Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[M1]</b> Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M2]</b> 1) Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies and procedures available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] 2) Have all board members (at least 1 year on board), completed Board Member Training? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> <u>  NA  </u> ] 3) Does the Board of Directors meet monthly and were minutes of Board meetings available for review during the survey? (NOTE: Minimum quarterly, if system has an officially designated full time manager? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> <u>  NA  </u> ] (NOTE: All YESs or NAs required to receive point). NA - Not Applicable	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M3]</b> Has the water system had any SDWA violations in the past 24 months? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 0 pt. N - 1 pt.	_____
<b>[M4]</b> Has the water system developed a long range improvements plan and was this plan available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[M5]</b> Does the water system have the ability to provide water during emergencies? (i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc.) [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>MANAGEMENT CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>		

Financial Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
<b>[F1]</b> Has the water system raised water rates in the past 5 years? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] (NOTE: Point may be awarded if the water system provides acceptable financial documentation clearly showing that a rate increase is not needed) (i.e. revenue has consistently exceeded expenditures by at least 10%, etc.)	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F2]</b> Does the water system have an officially adopted policy requiring that water rates be routinely reviewed and adjusted as appropriate and was this policy available for review during the survey? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F3]</b> Does the water system have an officially adopted cut-off policy for customers who do not pay their water bills, was a copy of this policy available for review by the regional engineer, and do system records (cut-off lists, etc.) clearly show that the water system effectively implements this cut-off policy? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F4]</b> Was a copy of the water system's officially adopted annual budget available for review by the regional engineer and does the water system's financial accounting system clearly and accurately track the expenditure and receipt of funds? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ]	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F5 - Municipal Systems]:</b> Is the municipality current in submitting audit reports to the State Auditor's Office? Was a copy of the latest audit report available for review at the time of the survey? Does this audit report clearly show that water and sewer fund account(s) are maintained separately from all other municipal accounts? NOTE: (Yes answer to all questions required to receive point.)	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>[F5 - Rural Systems]:</b> 1) Has the rural water system filed the required financial reports with State Auditor's Office and were these reports available for review? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] 2) Does the latest financial report show that receipts exceeded expenditures? [ <u>  Y  </u> <u>  N  </u> ] (NOTE: Yes answer to both questions required to receive point)	Y - 1 pt. N - 0 pt.	_____
<b>FINANCIAL CAPACITY RATING = [ _____ ] (total points)</b>		

# **Attachment B**

## **Summary Report of FY 2002 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Ratings**

This page intentionally left blank

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>ADAMS</b>					<b>BENTON</b>				
ADAMS CO W/A #2-SOUTH	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	BLACKJACK DEVELOPMENT ASSN	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
ADAMS CO W/A #3-PROVIDENCE	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	TOWN OF ASHLAND	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
ADAMS CO W/A #4-KAISER LAKE	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	TOWN OF HICKORY FLAT	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
BROADMOOR UTILITIES, INC	4.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	TOWN OF SNOW LAKE SHORES	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
CITY OF NATCHEZ	5.0	4.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	<b>BOLIVAR</b>				
INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	BAXTER HEALTHCARE CORP	5.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>
OAKLAND WATER WORKS	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	BOLIVAR COUNTY WATER ASSN	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>
TESI: BRYANDALE	1.0	1.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>	BOYLE-SKEENE W/A #2	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
<b>ALCORN</b>					BOYLE-SKENE W/A #3	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
ALCORN W/A #1-INDIAN SPRINGS	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	BOYLE-SKENE WATER ASSN	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
ALCORN W/A #2-BIGGERSVILLE	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF CLEVELAND	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
CITY OF CORINTH	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF MOUND BAYOU	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
FARMINGTON WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	CITY OF ROSEDALE	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
KOSSUTH W/A #1	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	CITY OF SHELBY	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
KOSSUTH W/A #2-BETHLEHEM	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	DEESON ROUNDLAKE #2	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
KOSSUTH W/A #3-PINE MOUNTAIN	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	DEESON-ROUNDLAKE WATER CORP	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
PRENTISS-ALCORN WATER ASSN	2.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.3</b>	DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY	3.0	0.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>
TOWN OF RIENZI	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	DELTA-CHOCTAW W/A #1	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
<b>AMITE</b>					DELTA-CHOCTAW W/A #2	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
COLES COMMUNITY WATER ASSN #2	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>	LAMONT WATER CORPORATION	4.0	1.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>
COLES WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>	NORTH BOLIVAR W/A	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
MARY SPRINGS WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	PORT OF ROSEDALE	4.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>
N CENTRAL AMITE WATER ASSN	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	RAY BROOKS SCHOOL	1.0	2.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>
NORTHEAST AMITE WATER ASSN	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	SCOTT COMBINED WATER & SEWER D	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
PINE STREET WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.3</b>	SYMONDS WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
TOWN OF CROSBY	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF ALLIGATOR	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF GLOSTER	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF BENOIT	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF LIBERTY	1.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.3</b>	TOWN OF BEULAH	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
WILK-AMITE W/A #1-SOUTH	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	TOWN OF BOYLE	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
WILK-AMITE W/A #2-NORTHWEST	5.0	4.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF DUNCAN	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
<b>ATTALA</b>					TOWN OF GUNNISON	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
CITY OF KOSCIUSKO	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF MERIGOLD	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
CONEHOMA WATER ASSN #1	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	TOWN OF PACE	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
CONEHOMA WATER ASSN #2	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	TOWN OF RENOVIA	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
ETHEL RURAL WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF SHAW	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
MCADAMS WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF WINSTONVILLE	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
MISSISSIPPI WATER COMPANY	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	<b>CALHOUN</b>				
OLD NATCHEZ TRACE-SALLIS	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	BIG CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>
POSSUMNECK-CARMACK W/A	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	CITY OF BRUCE	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
SPRINGDALE YOUTH CNT HWY 12-W	4.0	0.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	CITY OF CALHOUN CITY	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
SPRINGDALE YOUTH CNT HWY 19-N	4.0	0.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	CROSS-ROADS WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
SUGAR CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	DUNCAN HILL WATER SUPPLY	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
TOWN OF ETHEL	4.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	MACEDONIA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF MCCOOL	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	MIDWAY WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.0</b>
TOWN OF SALLIS	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	MT COMFORT W/A	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
ZAMA WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	MT COMFORT W/A #6-HWY 331	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
					MT COMFORT W/A-BANNER	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
					MT COMFORT W/A-MT MORIAH	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
					MT COMFORT W/A-PARIS	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
MT COMFORT W/A-SAREPTA	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	<b>CLAIBORNE</b>				
NEW LIBERTY WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
POPLAR SPRINGS W/A #1	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	C S & I WATER ASSN #1	4.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>
POPLAR SPRINGS W/A #2	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	GRAND GULF NUCLEAR GEN. STA.	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
SLATE SPRINGS WATER ASSN	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	HERMANVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
TOWN OF DERMA	4.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>	LORMAN W/A #3-WESTSIDE	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
TOWN OF PITTSBORO	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	PATTISON W/A-EAST	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
TOWN OF VARDAMAN	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	PATTISON W/A-WEST	1.0	1.0	3.0	<b>1.7</b>
<b>CARROLL</b>					REEDTOWN WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
BLACK HAWK WATER ASSN #1	2.0	0.0	3.0	<b>1.7</b>	ROMOLA WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.0</b>
BLACK HAWK WATER ASSN #2	2.0	0.0	3.0	<b>1.7</b>	TOWN OF PORT GIBSON	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
MCCARLEY WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.3</b>	<b>CLARKE</b>				
PELUCIA RURAL W/A #2-GRAV HILL	1.0	3.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	CITY OF QUITMAN	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
PELUCIA RURAL W/A #3-COILA	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	EAST QUITMAN W/A	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
PELUCIA RURAL W/A #4-NEW ZION	1.0	3.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	HARMONY WATER ASSN #7-N ENTERP	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
PELUCIA RURAL W/A #5	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	HARMONY WATER ASSOCIATION #1	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
TOWN OF CARROLLTON	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>	HARMONY WATER ASSOCIATION #2	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
TOWN OF NORTH CARROLLTON	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	HARMONY WATER ASSOCIATION #4	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF VAIDEN	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	HARMONY WATER ASSOCIATION #5	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
<b>CHICKASAW</b>					TOWN OF ENTERPRISE	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>
ATLANTA WATER SYSTEM, INC.	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	TOWN OF SHUBUTA	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
CCM WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	TOWN OF STONEWALL	2.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
CITY OF HOUSTON	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	VILLAGE OF PACHUTA	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
CITY OF OKOLONA	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	WAUTUBBEE WATER ASSN.	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
EAST CHICKASAW W/A #1	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	<b>CLAY</b>				
EAST CHICKASAW W/A #2	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	BRYAN FOODS	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
HOULKA-HOUSTON W/A	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF WEST POINT	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
SOUTHEAST CHICKASAW W/A #1	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	GOLDEN TRIANGLE W/A #1	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
SPARTA WATER ASSOCIATION #1	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	GOLDEN TRIANGLE W/A #2	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
THORN WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	SILOAM W/A #1	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF HOULKA	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	SILOAM W/A #2-GRIFFITH WELL	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
WOODLAND WATER WORKS #1	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	SILOAM W/A #3-BEASLEY WELL	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
<b>CHOCTAW</b>					SILOAM W/A #4-PINE BLUFF	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
CHOCTAW WATER ASSN	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	SILOAM W/A #5	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
FENTRESS COMMUNITY W/S	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	SILOAM W/A #6-UNA SYSTEM	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
FRENCH CAMP ACADEMY	5.0	4.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	SILOAM W/A #7-MULDON	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
FRENCH CAMP W/A #1	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	SILOAM W/A #8-BEASLEY	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
PAN HANDLE W/A #2	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>	SUN CREEK WATER INC-PHEBA	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
PAN HANDLE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	WHITE STATION WATER ASSN	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
REFORM WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>					
SIMPSON WATER ASSOCIATION #1	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>					
SIMPSON WATER ASSOCIATION #2	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>					
TOWN OF ACKERMAN	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>					
TOWN OF WEIR	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					
UNION W/A	3.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>					

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>COAHOMA</b>					<b>DESOTO</b>				
BOBO UTILITIES	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	BELMONT WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
CLARKSDALE PUBLIC UTILITIES	3.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	BRIGHT'S WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
COAHOMA JR COLLEGE	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	CITY OF HORN LAKE	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
DAVENPORT WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	CITY OF OLIVE BRANCH	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
FARRELL WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>	CITY OF OLIVE BRANCH-FAIRHAVEN	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
GREEN ACRES W/A-NORTH	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	CITY OF SOUTHAVEN	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
GREEN ACRES W/A-SOUTH	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	COUNTRY HAVEN MOBILE HOME PARK	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
IOC-LULA, INC/ISLE OF CAPRI	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	DAYS WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
LU-RAND WATER ASSN	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	DESOTO UTILITY-N HOLLY HILLS	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
MASCOT PLANTING CO	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	DESOTO UTILITY-S TWIN LAKES	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
MATTSON GIN WATER SYSTEM	4.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.7</b>	EUDORA WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
MOORE BAYOU W/A #2	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	HORN LAKE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
MOORE BAYOU WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	KOKO REEF WATER CO	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
PINE GROVE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	LEWISBURG WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
RENA LARA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	MAGNOLIA HILLS MHP	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
SHERARD WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>	METRO DESOTO UTILITY COMPANY	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
TOWN OF COAHOMA	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	NESBIT WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
TOWN OF FRIARS POINT	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	NORTH MS UTILITIES-BRIDGETOWN	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
TOWN OF JONESTOWN	3.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	NORTH MS UTILITIES-BUENA VISTA	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
TOWN OF LULA	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	NORTH MS UTILITIES-CHICK BLUFF	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
TOWN OF LYON	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	NORTH MS UTILITIES-LAKE O'HILL	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
WATER ASSOCIATION OF MOON LAKE	5.0	2.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	PLEASANT HILL WATER ASSN	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
<b>COPIAH</b>					SKYLANE MOBILE HOME PARK	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
COPIAH COUNTY INDUSTRIAL PARK	3.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>	TOWN OF HERNANDO	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
COPIAH W/A - BAYOU PIERRE #1	1.0	0.0	2.0	<b>1.0</b>	WALLS WATER ASSN- LAKE FOREST	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
COPIAH W/A - BAYOU PIERRE #2	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>	WALLS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
COPIAH W/A - GALLMAN	2.0	0.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>	<b>FORREST</b>				
COPIAH W/A - HAZLEHURST	2.0	0.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>	BARRONTOWN W/A	4.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>
COPIAH W/A - NEW ZION	2.0	0.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>	BLACK CREEK RETREAT	2.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.3</b>
CRYSTAL SPRINGS WATER SERVICE	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	BROOKLYN WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
HARMONY RIDGE WATER ASSN	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>	CAMP SHELBY TRAINING SITE	5.0	5.0	N.A	<b>5.0</b>
NORTHEAST COPIAH WATER ASSN	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CARNES WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF GEORGETOWN	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF HATTIESBURG	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
TOWN OF HAZLEHURST	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	CITY OF PETAL	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF WESSON	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	DIXIE COMMUNITY UTILITY ASSN.	5.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.3</b>
<b>COVINGTON</b>					EASTABUCHIE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
CITY OF COLLINS	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	GLENDALE UTILITY DISTRICT	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
COLD SPRINGS WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	HANCOCK MOBILE HOME PARK	0.0	1.0	0.0	<b>0.3</b>
NORTH COVINGTON W/A-NORTH	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	MCLAURIN WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
NORTH COVINGTON W/A-SOUTH	1.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.3</b>	RAWLS SPRINGS UTILITY DISTRICT	3.0	5.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
SALEM WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	SUNRISE UTILITY ASSN INC	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
SANDERSON BROS POULTRY	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>					
SANFORD WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>					
SOUTHSIDE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>					
SOUTHWEST COVINGTON W/A	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>					
TOWN OF MOUNT OLIVE	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>					
TOWN OF SEMINARY	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>					
WILLOW GROVE WATER ASSN	5.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.7</b>					

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>FRANKLIN</b>					<b>HANCOCK</b>				
FRANKLIN CO W/A-S MEADVILLE	1.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.0</b>	CHARLES B MURPHY SCHOOL	3.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>
FRANKLIN CO W/A-WEST ROXIE	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	CITY OF BAY ST LOUIS	5.0	5.0	1.0	<b>3.7</b>
FRANKLIN CO. W/A-BERRY TOWN	1.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.0</b>	CITY OF WAVELAND	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
FRANKLIN CO. W/A-W. MEADVILLE	1.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.0</b>	DIAMONDHEAD UTILITIES-NORTH	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
PROVIDENCE WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.0</b>	GULFVIEW SCHOOL	1.0	2.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>
SIXTOWN WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	JORDAN RIVER ESTATES WATER CO	2.0	1.0	0.5	<b>1.2</b>
TOWN OF BUDE	2.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	KILN WATER & FIRE PROT DIST	5.0	5.0	2.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF MEADVILLE	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	MASON TECHNOLOGY, INCORP	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
TOWN OF ROXIE	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	PLEASANT HILL WATER GROUP	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
<b>GEORGE</b>					PORT BIENVILLE IND PARK	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
AGRICOLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	2.0	1.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>	SCAFIDIS WHEEL INN & TLR PARK	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
BEXLEY WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	STENNIS INT AIRPORT & IND PARK	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
CITY OF LUCEDALE	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	STENNIS SPACE CENTER	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
COMBINED UTILITIES	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	SUNRISE MOBILE HOME PARK	2.0	2.0	0.5	<b>1.5</b>
MULTI-MART WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	TESI: CLERMONT HARBOR	1.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
ROCKY CREEK UTILITY	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	TESI: JOURDAN RIVER SHORES	3.0	2.0	1.5	<b>2.2</b>
<b>GREENE</b>					TESI: OAK HARBOR	1.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
BEAT III W/A #1-SAND HILL	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	TESI: WHITE CYPRESS LAKES	3.0	2.0	1.5	<b>2.2</b>
BEAT III W/A #3-JONATHAN	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	<b>HARRISON</b>				
LEAF WATER ASSOCIATION-SOUTH	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	APPLE VALLEY TRAILER PARK	1.0	1.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>
NEELY UTILITIES	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>	BAYOU BERNARD INDUSTRIAL PARK	4.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>
S E GREENE WATER AUTHORITY	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	BRADFORD PLACE SUBDIVISION	5.0	2.0	3.5	<b>3.5</b>
TOWN OF LEAKESVILLE	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	BROADWATER BEACH HOTEL	2.0	3.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>
TOWN OF MCLAIN	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	C & R PROPERTIES	1.0	1.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>
TOWN OF STATE LINE	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	CEDAR LAKE APARTMENTS	2.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>
<b>GRENADA</b>					CEDAR LAKE BILOXI, LLC	3.0	3.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>
CITY OF GRENADA	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CHARLOTTE DEV CO-KNOLLWOOD S/D	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
G T & Y WATER DISTRICT INC	3.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	CITY OF BILOXI	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
GRENADA CO W/S-GIRL SCOUT	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF BILOXI-CEDAR LAKE	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
GRENADA CO W/S-MONDY RD/ELLIOT	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF BILOXI-FRENCH	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
GRENADA IND PK & AIRPORT WATER	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>	CITY OF BILOXI-NORTH	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
GRENADA-BOGUE BASIN/GORE SPRGS	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	CITY OF BILOXI-SMITH WATER	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
GRENADA-BOGUE BASIN/HOLCOMB	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	CITY OF D'IBERVILLE-MAGNOLIA B	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
GT&Y UTL. DIST INC-SCENIC HILL	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	CITY OF GULFPORT	4.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>
POOR HOUSE W/A #1	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF GULFPORT-OAKLEIGH	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
POOR HOUSE W/A #2	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	CITY OF GULFPORT-ORANGE GROVE	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
YOUNG'S W/S DIST #1-DIVIDING R	4.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF LONG BEACH	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
YOUNG'S W/S DIST #2-YOUNGS SYS	4.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF PASS CHRISTIAN	4.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.7</b>
					COAST EPISCOPAL HIGH SCHOOL	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
					COUNTRY LIVING MOBILE HOME PK	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>
					D'IBERVILLE W/S	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
					DEDEAUX UTILITY COMPANY INC	4.0	2.0	3.5	<b>3.2</b>
					DEERWOOD UTILITIES	3.0	4.0	0.5	<b>2.5</b>
					DELISLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	3.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>
					DELISLE HEAD START	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
					DOGWOOD HILLS SUBDIVISION	3.0	1.0	1.5	<b>1.8</b>
					DOLANS MOBILE HOME PARK	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>
					DUPONT INC-DELISLE PLANT	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
					EDGEWATER GARDEN APARTMENT	2.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>
					HARRISON CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>



# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
HIGHWAY 49 MOBILE HOME PARK	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>	TOWN OF TERRY	4.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>
HOLIDAY INN	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	TOWN OF UTICA	1.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
HOMESTEAD MOBILE HOME PARK	4.0	2.0	2.5	<b>2.8</b>	TRI-STATE BRICK & TILE CO	4.0	1.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>
KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE	3.0	5.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>	UNIVERSITY OF MS MEDICAL CNTR	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
LIZANA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	<b>HOLMES</b>				
LYMAN UTILITIES	3.0	3.0	0.5	<b>2.2</b>	ACONA WATER ASSOCIATION #1	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
MISS POWER CO-WATSON ELEC PLT	5.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>	ACONA WATER ASSOCIATION #2	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTAL CTR	4.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	CASTALIAN W/A	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
PALMER CREEK UTILITY ASSC, INC	3.0	4.0	0.5	<b>2.5</b>	CASTALIAN W/A - SYSTEM B	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
PINE HAVEN MOBILE HOME VILLAGE	3.0	3.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>	CENTERVILLE COMMUNITY W/A	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
PINEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	CITY OF DURANT	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
PLUMMER SUBDIVISION	2.0	2.0	2.5	<b>2.2</b>	CITY OF LEXINGTON	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
RIDGECREST ESTATES	4.0	2.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>	EBENEZER RURAL WATER ASSN	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
RIVERBEND UTILITIES INC	4.0	2.0	2.5	<b>2.8</b>	HARLAND CREEK COMMUNITY W/A	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
ROBINWOOD FOREST UTILITY INC	3.0	4.0	0.5	<b>2.5</b>	HARLAND CREEK COMMUNITY W/A	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
SAUCIER UTILITIES	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	HARLAND CREEK COMMUNITY W/A-B	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
SHERWOOD VILLAGE MHP	1.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>	HOLMES INTERSTATE UTILITY DIST	5.0	2.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
SUPERIOR UTILITY	3.0	2.0	3.5	<b>2.8</b>	HOLMES JR COLLEGE	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
TESI: LAKEWOOD ENVIRONMENTAL	3.0	2.0	1.5	<b>2.2</b>	LEBANON W/A-EAST	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
TESI: PASS CHRISTIAN ISLES	2.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.8</b>	LEBANON W/A-WEST	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
TINY TOTS DAYCARE CENTER	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	SOUTH HOLMES W/A #1	3.0	5.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
TUXACHANIE ESTATES #1	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	SOUTH HOLMES W/A-B SYSTEM	3.0	5.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
TUXACHANIE ESTATES #2	2.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	SOUTH HOLMES W/A-CENTRAL	3.0	5.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
U. S. NAVAL HOME	4.0	5.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>	SWEET HOME WATER & SEWER DIST	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
WILLIAMS TRAVEL CENTER	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	TOWN OF CRUGER	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
WOOLMARKET VILLAGE ESTATES	4.0	2.0	3.5	<b>3.2</b>	TOWN OF GOODMAN	1.0	3.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
<b>HINDS</b>					TOWN OF PICKENS	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
CITY OF CLINTON	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	TOWN OF TCHULA	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
CITY OF JACKSON	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF WEST	4.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>
CITY OF JACKSON-MADDOX RD.	5.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	WEST HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
CITY OF RAYMOND	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	WEST HOLMES WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	4.0	1.0	<b>2.3</b>
COUNTRY OAKS MOBILE HOME PARK	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	<b>HUMPHREYS</b>				
EAST SIDE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	CITY OF BELZONI	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
FRIENDS OF ALCOHOLICS	3.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>	FRESHWATER FARMS	3.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>
HINDS CO DETENTION CTR	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	HUMPHREYS CO W/A #5-WOODYARD	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
HUBBARD WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	HUMPHREYS CO W/A #6-GOODEN LAK	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
JACKSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	4.0	1.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>	HUMPHREYS CO-TCHULA LAKE #7	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
MT OLIVE WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>	HUMPHREYS CO. W/A #1-MIDNIGHT	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
NORTH HINDS W/A #1-BROWNSVILLE	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	HUMPHREYS CO. W/A #2-BROOKLYN	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
NORTH HINDS W/A #2-CHAPEL HILL	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>	HUMPHREYS CO. W/A #3-JAKETOWN	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
NORTH HINDS W/A #4-K&P	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>	HUMPHREYS CO. W/A #4-C&M	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
NORTH HINDS W/A #5-LIMEKILN	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>	TOWN OF ISOLA	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
NORTH HINDS W/A-SHEPHERD HILLS	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>	TOWN OF LOUISE	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>
POCAHONTAS WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	TOWN OF SILVER CITY	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
PORT GIBSON-RATLIFF ROAD W/A	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>					
REEDTOWN WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					
SOUTH CENTRAL WATER ASSN	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>					
SOUTH TERRY WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>					
ST THOMAS WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>					
TOWN OF BOLTON	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>					
TOWN OF EDWARDS	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>					

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>ISSAQUENA</b>					ST MARTIN HIGH SCHOOL	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
GRACE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	SWEETBRIAR-TWIN BAYOU S/D	2.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
TALLULA UTILITY DISTRICT	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	TESI: BEACH BAYOU	2.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.8</b>
TOWN OF MAYERSVILLE	3.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	TESI: GULF PARK	2.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.8</b>
<b>ITAWAMBA</b>					TESI: LANGLEY POINT	2.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.8</b>
CITY OF FULTON	2.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	TESI: OCEAN BEACH	1.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
DORSEY WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	TESI: ROUSE'S	2.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.8</b>
HOUSTON-PALESTINE WATER ASSOC	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	TUCKER HILL WATER WORKS INC	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
N. E. MS. REGIONAL W/S	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	VANCLEAVE HIGH SCHOOL	2.0	3.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>
NE ITAWAMBA W/A #1-RIDGE	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	VANCLEAVE SCHOOL	1.0	2.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>
NE ITAWAMBA W/A #2-SALEM	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	WEST JACKSON CO UTILITY DIST	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
TOMBIGBEE W/A #1	4.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>	WESTWICK UTILITY PORTEAUX BAY	3.0	3.0	3.5	<b>3.2</b>
TOWN OF MANTACHIE	4.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.7</b>	WOODLAND PARK	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>
TOWN OF TREMONT	3.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	<b>JASPER</b>				
<b>JACKSON</b>					BEAVER MEADOW WATER ASSN.	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
BLUFF CREEK MOBILE HOME PARK	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>	BEAVERDAM W/A-NORTH	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
CENTRAL COUNTY BARN	4.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	LAKE EDDINS	3.0	2.0	0.5	<b>1.8</b>
CHEVRON USA	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>	LOUIN WATER WORKS	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>
CITY OF MOSS POINT	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	PAULDING WATER WORKS ASSN	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
CITY OF OCEAN SPRINGS	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	PHILADELPHIA WATER ASSN	3.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
CITY OF PASCAGOULA	5.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.3</b>	ROSE HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
COAST WATER WORKS	2.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	STRINGER WATER WORKS	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
COAST WATER WORKS-GULF HILLS	2.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	TALLAHALA W/A-ANTIOCH	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
COAST WATER WORKS-SWEETBRIAR	2.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	TALLAHALA W/A-BAXTER	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
COLONIAL ESTATES # 3	2.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	TALLAHALA W/A-GARLANDSVILLE	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
E G TAYLOR WATER SYSTEM	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>	TALLAHALA W/A-TED CLEAR	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
EAST CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	TOWN OF BAY SPRINGS	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>
ESCATAWPA UTILITY DISTRICT	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF HEIDELBERG	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
GAUTIER UTILITY DISTRICT	3.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	TOWN OF MONTROSE	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
GULF BREEZE MOBILE HOME PARK	1.0	1.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>	TRI-COUNTY W/A #1-JASPER	5.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.3</b>
HELENA PARK WATER SYSTEM	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	TRI-COUNTY W/A #3-SUMMERLAND	3.0	5.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
INGALLS SHIP BLDG EAST BANK	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	<b>JEFF DAVIS</b>				
INGALLS SHIPBLDG CORP-WEST BK	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>	CARSON CENTRAL WATER ASSN	2.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.3</b>
J & J WATER CO #1-TUCKER PARK	2.0	3.0	0.5	<b>1.8</b>	DOUBLE PONDS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
JACKSON CO E. PORT AUTH.	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	GOOD HOPE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
JACKSON CO WEST PORT AUTH.	4.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	LILY ROSE W/A #1	1.0	3.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
JACKSON CO. E PORT AUTHORITY	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	LILY ROSE W/A #2	1.0	3.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
JACKSON CO. PORT AUTH-SUNPLEX	4.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	LOWLAND UTILITY WATER ASSN	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
JACKSON COUNTY BARN	4.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	NORTHEAST JEFF DAVIS W/A	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
KREBS TRAILER PLAZA	1.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	TOWN OF BASSFIELD	1.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>
MAGNOLIA UTILITIES	2.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	TOWN OF PRENTISS	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
MISS. PHOSPHATES CORP.	2.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>					
MOCKINGBIRD TRAILER PARK	1.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>					
MS. POWER CO- DANIEL STEAM PLT	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>					
NAVAL STATION-PASCAGOULA	4.0	5.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>					
ORANGE LAKE ELEMENTARY	1.0	0.0	N.A	<b>0.5</b>					
P.A.C. UTILITY CO, INC.	4.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>					
PINE GROVE WATER SYSTEM INC	2.0	3.0	0.5	<b>1.8</b>					
SEVENTH STREET SUBDIVISION	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>					
ST ANDREWS WATER & SEWER, INC	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>JEFFERSON</b>					<b>LAFAYETTE</b>				
CANNONBURG-CHURCH HILL W A	1.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.3</b>	A B E BRITTANY WOODS WATER SYS	2.0	3.0	1.5	<b>2.2</b>
LORMAN WATER ASSOCIATION #1	0.0	3.0	5.0	<b>2.7</b>	ABBEVILLE WATER ASSN	2.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.3</b>
LORMAN WATER ASSOCIATION #2	2.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>	ABE COLLEGE HILL HEIGHTS W/SYS	2.0	2.0	2.5	<b>2.2</b>
MCNAIR-STAMPLEY W/A #1	3.0	3.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>	ABE LAFAYETTE CIVIC CENTER W/S	1.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
MCNAIR-STAMPLEY W/A #2	2.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	ABE LAKEWAY GARDENS WATER SYS	2.0	2.0	2.5	<b>2.2</b>
TOWN OF FAYETTE	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	ABE QUAIL CREEK WATER SYSTEM	2.0	2.0	2.5	<b>2.2</b>
UNION CHURCH WATERWORKS ASSN	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	ABE THACKER HEIGHTS WATER SYS	2.0	2.0	2.5	<b>2.2</b>
<b>JONES</b>					ABE TULA WATER SYSTEM	2.0	1.0	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
CALHOUN WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	ABE WEST SPRING HILL WATER SYS	1.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
CITY OF ELLISVILLE	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	ABE WESTERN HILLS WATER SYSTEM	1.0	2.0	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
CITY OF LAUREL	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>	ANCHOR WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
ELLISVILLE STATE SCHOOL	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	CAMPGROUND WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
ELLISVILLE STATE SCHOOL	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	CITY OF OXFORD	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
ERATA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	COLLEGE HILL WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
GLADE WATERWORKS ASSN	4.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	COTTAGE POINTE WATER SYSTEM	2.0	1.0	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
HATTEN WATER ASSN	3.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	DENMARK WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
J P UTILITY DIST #2	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	DOOLEYVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>
J P UTILITY DISTRICT	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	E L HOOKER SUBDIVISION	4.0	3.0	3.5	<b>3.5</b>
M & M WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	EAST OXFORD WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>
MATTHEWS MOSS WATER ASSN	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	EMERSON MOTOR DIVISION	5.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>
MOSELLE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	GEORGIA PACIFIC CORP	5.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>
MOTORAMA MOBILE HOME PARK	2.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>	HARMONTOWN WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
OAK GROVE WATER ASSN	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	HOPEWELL WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>
PINE GROVE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	HURRICANE CREEK WATER ASSN	3.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>
PLEASANT RIDGE W/A	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	HURRICANE HILLS W/A	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
POWERS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	LAFAYETTE SPRINGS WATER ASSN	5.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
SHADY GROVE UTILITY DISTRICT	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	OAKVIEW MANOR APARTMENTS	1.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>
SHARON WATER WORKS	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	OXFORD-LAFAYETTE IND. PARK	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
SOSO COMMUNITY WATER SYS. INC	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	PINE CREEK COVE APTS.	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
SOUTHERN HEN INC	5.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>	PUNKIN W/A #1	1.0	2.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
SOUTHWEST JONES W/A-NORTH	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	PUNKIN W/A #2-DEER RUN	0.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.0</b>
SOUTHWEST JONES W/A-SOUTH	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	SANDERS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF SANDERSVILLE	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	TAYLOR WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>
<b>KEMPER</b>					TURNER SPRINGS WATER ASSN	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
KIPLING W/A #1	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
KIPLING W/A #2	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	WELLSGATE UTILITY CO, INC	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
KIPLING W/A #3-OLD SCOоба RD	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>	WESTOVER WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
NW KEMPER W/A #1-PRESTON	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	WOODLAND HILLS WATER SYSTEM	2.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.0</b>
NW KEMPER W/A #2-PILGRIM EXT	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	YOCONA WATER ASSOCIATION, INC.	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
NW KEMPER W/A #3-KYNARD	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>					
PORTERVILLE W/A	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>					
PORTERVILLE W/A-KEMPER SPRINGS	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>					
TOWN OF DEKALB	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>					
TOWN OF SCOоба	5.0	2.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>					
TOWNSEND WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	2.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>					

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>LAMAR</b>					<b>LEAKE</b>				
ARNOLD LINE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	CHOCTAW MAID FARMS	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>
BILL'S TRAILER PARK	1.0	1.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>	CHOCTAW MAID FARMS COMMUNITY	2.0	1.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>
CANEBRAKE UTILITY ASSOC INC	3.0	3.0	2.5	<b>2.8</b>	CITY OF CARTHAGE	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
CITY OF LUMBERTON	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	EDINBURG WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
LAMAR PARK WATER & SEWAGE ASSN	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>	FREENY W/A #1	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
NORTH LAMAR WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	FREENY W/A #2-ROSEBUD SYSTEM	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
NORTH LUMBERTON UTILITY ASSN	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	GOSHEN WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>
PROGRESS COMM WATER ASSN	3.0	5.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	LENA WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	0.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>
R D MORROW POWER PLANT	5.0	5.0	N.A	<b>5.0</b>	MARYDELL WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF PURVIS	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	NEW PROVIDENCE WATER ASSN	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF SUMRALL	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	PILGRIM REST WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
WEST LAMAR WATER ASSN #1	5.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.3</b>	SOUTHWEST LEAKE WATER ASSN	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
<b>LAUDERDALE</b>					THOMASTOWN WATER ASSOCIATIO	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
CITY OF MERIDIAN	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	TOWN OF WALNUT GROVE	2.0	5.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
CLARKDALE WATER ASSN # 1	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	<b>LEE</b>				
COLLINSVILLE WATER ASSN	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	BREWER WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
LONG CREEK W/A (WHYNOT)	3.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	BURLESON MOBILE HOME PARK	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>
LONG CREEK WATER ASSN #1	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	CITY OF NETTLETON	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
LONG CREEK WATER ASSN #2	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF SALTILLO-WESTWOOD	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
MERIDIAN NAVAL AIR STATION	4.0	5.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>	CITY OF TUPELO	5.0	4.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>
NORTH LAUDERDALE W/A, INC	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF VERONA	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
NTS UTILITY ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	CITY POINT WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.3</b>
RUSSELL UTILITIES INC	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	MOOREVILLE RICHMOND #3	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
SOUTHWEST LAUDERDALE W/A	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	MOOREVILLE RICHMOND W/A#4	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
TOOMSUBA WATER SYSTEM	2.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>	MOOREVILLE-RICHMOND W/A #1	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF MARION	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	MOOREVILLE-RICHMOND W/A #2	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
<b>LAWRENCE</b>					NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
CROOKED CREEK WTR ASSN-NORTH	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	NORTH LEE W/A #1-BARNES CROSN	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
CROOKED CREEK WTR ASSN-SOUTH	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	NORTH LEE W/A #2-BIRMINGHAM RD	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
GEORGIA-PACIFIC	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>	NORTH LEE W/A #3-CEDAR HILL	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
JAYESS-TOPEKA-TILTON W/A	1.0	3.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	NORTH LEE W/A #4-MACEDONIA	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
LAWRENCE COUNTY WATER ASSN.	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	OLD UNION WATER ASSN.	2.0	4.0	1.0	<b>2.3</b>
MT ZION W/A	3.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	PALMETTO W/A-SOUTH	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
SONTAG-WANILLA	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>	TOWN OF GUNTOWN	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
TOWN OF MONTICELLO	3.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.3</b>	TOWN OF PLANTERSVILLE	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
TOWN OF NEW HEBRON	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF SALTILLO	2.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
TOWN OF SILVER CREEK	1.0	3.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF SHANNON	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
					TUPELO-LEE INDUSTRIAL PARK	5.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>
					TURNER INDUSTRIAL PARK	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
					WEBB UTILITY SYS, INC-INDIAN H	3.0	2.0	2.5	<b>2.5</b>
					WIDESPREAD WWORKS, INC-LAK PI	1.0	2.0	2.5	<b>1.8</b>

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>LEFLORE</b>					SAND ROAD TRAILER PARK	3.0	2.0	3.5	<b>2.8</b>
AMERICA CATCH CATFISH PLANT	3.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>	SHERIFF BOYS RANCH	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
AMERICA'S CATCH-THE FARM	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>	SMITH'S MOBILE HOME PARK	2.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
BLUE LAKE WATER ASSN. INC	5.0	2.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	SOUTH LOWNDES W/A	4.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
BRALEY CAMPSITE	2.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>	TOWN OF ARTESIA	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
CHAPMAN S/D-NORTH-DELTA DRILNG	1.0	0.0	1.5	<b>0.8</b>	TOWN OF CALEDONIA	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
CHAPMAN S/D-SOUTH-DELTA DRILNG	1.0	0.0	1.5	<b>0.8</b>	TOWN OF CRAWFORD	4.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
CITY OF GREENWOOD	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	WEYERHAEUSER WELL # 1	5.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>
CITY OF ITTA BENA	4.0	5.0	2.0	<b>3.7</b>	<b>MADISON</b>				
CITY OF SCHLATER	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	BEAR CREEK W/A -EAST	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
CITY OF SCHLATER-(P D PLANT)	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	BEAR CREEK W/A-WEST	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
EAST LEFLORE WATER & SEWER DST	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	BIG BLACK W/A-CAMDEN	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
FREDRICK S/D-DELTA DRILLING	1.0	1.0	1.5	<b>1.2</b>	BIG BLACK WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
HEARTLAND CATFISH	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	CAMERON COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEM	3.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
LONG ACRES S/D-DELTA DRILLING	2.0	0.0	1.5	<b>1.2</b>	CANTON MUN UTL	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
MALOUF'S TRAILER COURT & APTS	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>	CITY OF CANTON	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
MINTER CITY WATER & SEWER	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>	CITY OF MADISON	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
MORGAN CITY WATER & SEWER ASSN	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF RIDGELAND	3.0	5.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
MS VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY	2.0	3.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>	CMU-LAKE CAROLINE	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
PHILLIPSTOWN WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	CMU-LAKE CAROLINE	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
PILLOW ACADEMY	2.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>	EAST MADISON WATER ASSN-WEST	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
TOWN OF SIDON	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>	LAKE LORMAN UTL DISTRICT	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
VIKING SPECIALTY PRODUCTS	5.0	3.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>	LIVINGSTON ROAD WATER ASSN	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
<b>LINCOLN</b>					PRVWSD-MAIN HARBOR	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
BOGUE CHITTO WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>	PRVWSD-TWIN HARBOR	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
CITY OF BROOKHAVEN	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOUGALOO COLLEGE	3.0	1.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>
LINCOLN RURAL W/A-BEAUREGARD	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	TOWN OF FLORA #1	3.0	5.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>
LINCOLN RURAL W/A-BRIGNAL	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	TOWN OF FLORA #2	3.0	5.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>
LINCOLN RURAL W/A-HEUCKS RET	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	WEST MADISON UTL DIST	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
LINCOLN RURAL W/A-OLD RED STAR	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	<b>MARION</b>				
LINCOLN RURAL W/A-PLEASANT RID	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	BUNKER HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
LINCOLN RURAL W/A-ZETUS	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CEDAR GROVE-HARMONY W/A	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>
TOPIAW CREEK	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	CITY OF COLUMBIA	4.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.3</b>
TOPIAW CREEK W/A-RUTH	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	COMMUNITY WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	0.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
<b>LOWNDES</b>					FOXWORTH WATER & SEWERAGE ASSN	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
AIRBASE TRAILER PARK	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	GOSS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
AIRBASE VILLAGE	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	HIGHWAY 98 EAST WATER ASSN.	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
CITY OF COLUMBUS	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	HUB WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>
COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>	KOKOMO-SHILOH WATER ASSN.	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
CORP OF ENGINEERS WWMC/C	4.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	LAMPTON WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
COUNTRY COURTS	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	MORGANTOWN WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
EAST LOWNDES #4-HERMAN-VAUGHN	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	MS DEPT OF YOUTH SERVICES	3.0	1.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>
EAST LOWNDES W/A #1-LEE STOKES	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	MT GILEAD-IMPROVE WATER ASSN	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>
EAST LOWNDES W/A #2-HUCKLEBERR	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	WEST MARION WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
EAST LOWNDES W/A #3-OLD YORKVI	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>					
EAST MS COMM COLLEGE-GOLDEN TR	5.0	4.0	0.0	<b>3.0</b>					
GOLDEN TRIANGLE IND. PARK	5.0	4.0	0.0	<b>3.0</b>					
HOLNAM INC WATER SYSTEM	5.0	3.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>					
LOWNDES CO W/A # 1	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>					
PARKER'S MOBILE HOME PARK	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>					

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N/A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>MARSHALL</b>					<b>NESHOBA</b>				
BCM WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	CENTRAL W/A-#1	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
CITY OF HOLLY SPRINGS	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	CENTRAL W/A-ARLINGTON	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
COUNTRY VIEW FARMS	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	CENTRAL W/A-EAST SIDE	1.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
GALENA SCHOOL	3.0	2.0	N/A	<b>2.5</b>	CENTRAL W/A-HOUSE	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
H. W. BYERS HIGH SCHOOL	3.0	2.0	N/A	<b>2.5</b>	CENTRAL W/A-KENTAWKA VALLEY	2.0	5.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
HOLLY SPRINGS LAKE ESTATES-E	2.0	3.0	0.5	<b>1.8</b>	CENTRAL W/A-NORTH PEARL RIVER	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
MARSHALL CO WATER ASSN	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	CENTRAL W/A-SOUTHWEST	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
MT PLEASANT HEADSTART	2.0	0.0	N/A	<b>1.0</b>	CENTRAL W/A-UNION	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
PICKARD'S WATER ASSN.	1.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.0</b>	CITY OF PHILADELPHIA	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
SOUTH VICTORIA	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>	<b>NEWTON</b>				
TOWN OF BYHALIA	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	BEULAH HUBBARD WATER ASSN	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF POTTS CAMP	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF NEWTON	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
WARSAW WATER SYSTEM	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>	DUFFEE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
<b>MONROE</b>					NORTH DECATUR W/A #1	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
CASON WATER ASSOCIATION #2	4.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	SOUTH NEWTON RURAL W/A #1	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
CITY OF AMORY	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	SOUTH NEWTON RURAL W/A #2	3.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
COONTAIL WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	SOUTH NEWTON RURAL W/A #4	3.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
GAINES-TRACE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	TOWN OF CHUNKY	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
HAMILTON WATER DISTRICT	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	TOWN OF DECATUR	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
KERR MCGEE CHEMICAL	5.0	5.0	N/A	<b>5.0</b>	TOWN OF HICKORY	2.0	4.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
QUINCY WATER ASSOCIATION #1	5.0	4.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF UNION	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
QUINCY WATER ASSOCIATION #2	5.0	4.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	<b>NOXUBEE</b>				
TOWN OF ABERDEEN	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	BARGE FOREST PRODUCTS	3.0	2.0	N/A	<b>2.5</b>
TOWN OF HATLEY	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	COLLEGE STREET WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
TOWN OF SMITHVILLE	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	MACON ELECTRIC & WATER DEPT.	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
VILLAGE OF GATTMAN	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	MASHULAVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
WREN W/A #1-SOUTH	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	PARKS UTILITIES	3.0	3.0	1.5	<b>2.5</b>
<b>MONTGOMERY</b>					PINEY WOODS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
51-55 WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	SALEM-CONCORD WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
CITY OF WINONA	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	SHUQUALAK-BUTLER W/A	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
ESKRIDGE-ROSE HILL W/A	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	SOUTHEAST NOXUBEE WATER ASSN	4.0	0.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>
HAYS CREEK W/A-ALVA	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	TOWN OF BROOKSVILLE	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
HAYS CREEK W/A-LEGION LAKE RD	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	TOWN OF SHUQUALAK	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
HAYS CREEK W/A-LODI	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	<b>OKTIBBEHA</b>				
HAYS CREEK W/A-MINERVA	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	ADATON W/A #1-JOSEY CREEK	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
HAYS CREEK W/A-MINERVA #2	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	BLACK JACK WATER ASSN #1	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
HAYS CREEK W/A-MISSION ROAD	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	BLUEFIELD WATER ASSOCIATION #1	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
HAYS CREEK W/A-NEW LIBERTY	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	BRADLEY WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
NORTH DISTRICT 1 WATER ASSN.	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	CENTER GROVE W/A #1	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
POPLAR CREEK WATER ASSN.	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	CENTER GROVE W/A #2	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
POPLAR CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	CHAPEL HILL-PLEASANT GROVE W/A	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
SOUTH WINONA WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	CITY OF STARKVILLE	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
STEWART WATER ASSC #2	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	CLAYTON VILLAGE W/A #1-EAST	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
STEWART WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	CLAYTON VILLAGE-UNIV HEIGHTS	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF DUCK HILL	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	CRAIG SPRINGS WATER ASSN #1	3.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>
TOWN OF KILMICHAEL	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	CRAIG SPRINGS WATER ASSN #2	3.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>
					DOUBLE SPRINGS WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
					EAGLE FAMILY FOODS INC	5.0	4.0	N/A	<b>4.5</b>

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
EAST LEE BLVD WATER ASSN.	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	<b>PEARL RIVER</b>				
LONGVIEW WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>	BI COUNTY WATER ASSN	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
MHOON FARM WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	CENTER W/A-CAESAR SYSTEM	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
MORGAN CHAPEL WATER ASSN	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	CENTER W/A-PROGRESS SYSTEM	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
MORRILL ROAD WATER ASSOCIA	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	DIXIE UTILITIES, INC	0.0	0.0	0.5	<b>0.2</b>
MS STATE UNIVERSITY	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>	HIDE-A-WAY LAKE WATER SYSTEM	3.0	3.0	3.5	<b>3.2</b>
NEW LIGHT WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	LAKE DAVID WATER SERVICE	3.0	3.0	1.5	<b>2.5</b>
OKTOC WATER ASSOCIATION #1	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	LIBERTY ROAD TRAILER PARK	2.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>
OLD WEST POINT ROAD WATER ASSN	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	NICHOLSON WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
PARCO, INC	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	PEARL RIVER CENTRAL W/A	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
ROCK HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	PEARL RIVER CENTRAL W/A-NORTH	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
SESSUMS WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	PICAYUNE UTILITIES, CITY OF	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
SOUTHSIDE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	SPRING HILL WATER ASSN.	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
TALKING WARRIOR WATER ASSN #1	3.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	SUNNY OAKS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF MABEN	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	TIMBERLANE-VIRGINIA MANOR	2.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.7</b>
TOWN OF STURGIS	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF POPLARVILLE	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
TRIMCANE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	<b>PERRY</b>				
TURKEY CREEK WATER ASSN.	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	ARLINGTON W/A	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
UNIVERSITY COMMONS APTS.	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	ARLINGTON W/A-HINTONVILLE	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
WAKE FOREST WATER ASSN	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	GEORGIA PACIFIC PULP MILL	5.0	5.0	N.A	<b>5.0</b>
<b>PANOLA</b>					GEORGIA PACIFIC SAWMILL	5.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.5</b>
ASL WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	JANICE W/A #1	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
CHICKASAW HILLS SUBDIVISION	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	JANICE W/A #2-SOUTH	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
CITY OF BATESVILLE	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	LITTLE CREEK WATER ASSN	3.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
CITY OF SARDIS	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	N E PERRY UTL ASSN-#1	3.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
CONCORD-MACEDONIA W/A	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	RUNNELSTOWN-NORTH	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
ENID SHORES DEV WATER COMPANY	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	TOWN OF BEAUMONT	4.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.7</b>
ENON-LOCKE-CURTIS WATER ASSN	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF NEW AUGUSTA	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
EUREKA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF RICHTON	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
FERN HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	<b>PIKE</b>				
HEBRON WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	CITY OF MAGNOLIA	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
HIDE-A-WAY HILLS WATER COMPANY	1.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.0</b>	CITY OF MCCOMB	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
HOTOPHIA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	EAST PIKE WATER ASSN.	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
INDEPENDENCE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	FERNWOOD INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPP	2.0	1.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>
LIBERTY HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	FERNWOOD WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
LOVE JOY WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	FRIENDSHIP COMMUNITY W/A	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
MT OLIVET WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	HOMESTEAD WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
NORTH PANOLA UTILITY	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	MAGNOLIA RURAL WATER ASSN	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
PANOLA-UNION W/A	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	MID CITY WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
PLEASANT GROVE WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	NORTH PIKE WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
POPE-COURTLAND W/A-NORTH	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	NORTH STREET WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.0</b>
POPE-COURTLAND WATER ASSN	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	SANDERSON FARMS	3.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>
SARDIS LAKE COMMUNITY W/A	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	ST MARY OF THE PINES	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF COMO	3.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.3</b>	SUNNY HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
TOWN OF CRENSHAW	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>	SW MS COMM COLLEGE	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
WALNUT HILLS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	TOWN OF OSYKA	3.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>
					TOWN OF SUMMIT	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>PONTOTOC</b>					<b>RANKIN</b>				
ALGOMA WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	ACL WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
ALGOMA WATER ASSOCIATION #2	3.0	5.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	ACL WATER ASSOCIATION #2	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
CITY OF PONTOTOC	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	CENTRAL MISS CORR FACILITY	2.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>
EAST PONTOTOC WATER ASSN	1.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	CENTRAL RANKIN WATER ASSN	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
HOULKA-WASHINGTON EXT	2.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	CITY OF BRANDON	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
MUD CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF FLOWOOD-CASTLEWOOD DIV	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>
MUD CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION #2	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF FLOWOOD-N. WELL	3.0	3.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>
OAK HILL WATER ASSN #1	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	CITY OF PEARL	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
OAK HILL WATER ASSN #2	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	CITY OF PEARL-WASHINGTON DIV	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
RANDOLPH WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	3.0	1.0	<b>2.3</b>	CITY OF RICHLAND	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
TOCCOPOLA WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	CLEARY WATER SEWER & FIRE DEPT	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
TOCCOPOLA WATER ASSOCIATION #2	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	CLEVELAND'S TRAILER PARK	2.0	3.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>
TOWN OF ECRU	5.0	4.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>	EVERGREEN WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.0</b>
TOWN OF SHERMAN	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	FANNIN WATER ASSN-NORTH	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
TROY WATER ASSOCIATION #1	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	FIVE LAKES WATER SYSTEM	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
<b>PRENTISS</b>					GREENFIELD WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>
BIG V WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	GULFLINE INDUSTRIAL PARK	2.0	3.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>
BLACKLAND WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	HUDSPETH CENTER	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>
BOONEVILLE WATER DEPT.	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>	LANGFORD WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
HOLCUT-CAIRO WATER ASSN	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	LEESBURG WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
INGRAM WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	MISSISSIPPI STATE FIRE ACADEMY	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>
NEW CANDLER WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	MONTEREY WATER ASSN-WEST	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
NEW SITE WATER ASSOCIATI	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	MS STATE HOSPITAL-WHITFIELD	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>
THRASHER WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	NORANCO UTILITIES	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF BALDWIN	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	PINEY WOODS COUNTRY LIFE SCH	2.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>
TOWN OF JUMPERTOWN	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	PISGAH WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
TOWN OF MARIETTA	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	PRVWSD-HIGHWAY 43	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
WHEELER-FRANKSTOWN WATER ASSN	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	PRVWSD-PELAHATCHIE BAY	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
<b>QUITMAN</b>					R & G PROPERTIES	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
BELEN WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	SANDERSON FARMS	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
BIG FIELD WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	SE RANKIN WATER ASSN-CATO	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
BIRDIE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	SE RANKIN WATER ASSN-JOHNS	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
CITY OF MARKS	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	SOUTHERN RANKIN W/A #2 PLAIN	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
DARLING WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	STAR WATER COMPANY	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
NORFLEET UTILITIES, INC	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	SW RANKIN WATER ASSOCIATION #1	4.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
SOUTH LAKE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	SW RANKIN WATER ASSOCIATION #2	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
SOUTH QUITMAN-N TUTWILER UTL	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	TAYLORSVILLE W/A #1	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
SOUTH QUITMAN-S LAMBERT UTL	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	TAYLORSVILLE W/A #2	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
SOUTH QUITMAN-WEST CROWDER	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	THOMASVILLE W/A #1	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>
TOWN OF CROWDER	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	THOMASVILLE W/A #2	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>
TOWN OF FALCON	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF FLORENCE	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
TOWN OF LAMBERT	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF PELAHATCHIE	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF SLEDGE	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	UNION WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
WEST LAMBERT WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>	VILLAGE OF PUCKETT	2.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.3</b>



# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>SCOTT</b>					<b>SMITH</b>				
C & C W/A #1-(CLIFTON)	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>	CENTER RIDGE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
C & C W/A #2-(CASH)	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>	CITY OF RALEIGH	2.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
C & C W/A #3	1.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.3</b>	LORENA-LEMON-BURNS WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
CITY OF FOREST	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	MORRIS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
CITY OF MORTON	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	PINEVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
H & H WATER SYSTEM, INC	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	PINEVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION #2	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
HIGH HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	PINEVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION #3	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
HOMESTEAD WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	3.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	POLKVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
HOMEWOOD WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>	SYLVARENA WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>
KOCH FOODS OF MISSISSIPPI, LLC	2.0	1.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>	TOWN OF MIZE	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
L & F WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF TAYLORSVILLE	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
LAKE WATER WORKS	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	TRAXLER WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
RAYTHEON CORP	2.0	3.0	N.A	<b>2.5</b>	WHITE OAK WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
SEBASTOPOL WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	<b>STONE</b>				
STEELE-RINGGOLD W/A #1	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	BOND COM UTILITY INC	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
STEELE-RINGGOLD W/A #2	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF WIGGINS	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
<b>SHARKEY</b>					FLINT CREEK UTILITY ASSN	3.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
CITY OF ROLLING FORK	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	MCHENRY UTILITY ASSN, INC	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
DELTA CITY WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	MS GULF COAST JUNIOR COLLEGE	2.0	1.0	N.A	<b>1.5</b>
LAMENDSOLF SUBDIVISION	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	NEW ZION UTILITY ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
TOWN OF ANGUILLA	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	STONE UTILITY ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
TOWN OF CARY	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>	SUNFLOWER UTILITY ASSC INC	3.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
TRUELIGHT REDEVELOPMENT GROUP	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	<b>SUNFLOWER</b>				
TRUELIGHT REDEVELOPMENT GROUP	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	ALLEN CANNING PLANT	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
<b>SIMPSON</b>					BIG YEAGER WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
BOGGAN RIDGE W/A	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	CITY OF INDIANOLA	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
BOGGAN RIDGE W/A-#2	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	CITY OF RULEVILLE	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
BOGGAN RIDGE W/A-PINE GROVE	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	DELTA PRIDE SOUTH	3.0	3.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>
BOSWELL RETARDATION CENTER	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>	FMH WATER ASSN #2-BLAINE	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
CITY OF MAGEE	3.0	3.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>	FMH WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
CITY OF MENDENHALL	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	MS STATE PENITENTIARY-MN LN	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
HARRISVILLE WATER ASSN #1	1.0	1.0	3.0	<b>1.7</b>	ROME WATER SYSTEM	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
HIGHWAY 28 WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	5.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>	S0. SUNFLOWER W/A-INVERNESS	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
HOWARD INDUTRIES	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	SO SUNFLOWER W/A-INDIANOLA	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
NEW HOPE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	SUNFLOWER WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>
OKATOMA WATER ASSOCIATION #2	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF DODDSVILLE	4.0	1.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>
OKOTOMA WATER ASSOCIATION #1	2.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	TOWN OF DREW	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
POPLAR SPRINGS WATER DISTRICT	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>	TOWN OF INVERNESS	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
SHIVERS WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	TOWN OF MOORHEAD	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
SMITH'S CROSSING WATER ASSN	1.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.0</b>	TOWN OF SUNFLOWER	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>
TOWN OF BRAXTON	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>					
TOWN OF D'LO	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>					

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>TALLAHATCHIE</b>					<b>TISHOMINGO</b>				
BLUE CANE, COWART & TIPPO W/A.	3.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	CITY OF IUKA	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
BLUE CANE-COWART-TIPPO W/A	2.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	DENNIS WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
BRAZIL-SUMNER WATER ASSN.	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	SHORT COLEMAN-NASA PLANT	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
CASCILLA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	SHORT-COLEMAN WATER ASSN #2	5.0	2.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
CHARLESTON UTILITIES	4.0	3.0	3.5	<b>3.5</b>	SHORT-COLEMAN WATER ASSN #3	5.0	2.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
EAST CHARLESTON WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>	TISHOMINGO CO WATER DISTRICT	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
HWY S/D WATER SYSTEM-DELTA DRL	1.0	1.0	1.5	<b>1.2</b>	TOWN OF BELMONT	5.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.7</b>
NORTH TALLAHATCHIE W/A	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	TOWN OF BURNSVILLE	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
PAYNE WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF GOLDEN WATER DEPT	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
PHILIPP WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	TOWN OF TISHOMINGO	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
SOUTH QUITMAN-EAST TUTWILER	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	WALKER SWITCH WATER ASSN	5.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
SOUTH QUITMAN-SOUTH TUTWILER	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	<b>TUNICA</b>				
SPRING HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.0</b>	CHARLIE'S CAMP WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>
TOWN OF SUMNER	5.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	DUNDEE WATER ASSN-LULA SYSTEM	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
TOWN OF TUTWILER	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	HARRAH'S TUNICA INC	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>
TOWN OF WEBB	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>	KWP UTILITY COMPANY LLC	5.0	5.0	3.0	<b>4.3</b>
VILLAGE OF GLENDORA	3.0	0.0	1.0	<b>1.3</b>	NEL-WIN CAMP	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
WEST TALLAHATCHIE UTL ASSN	2.0	0.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>	PRIDE OF THE POND	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>
<b>TATE</b>					TESI: WHITE OAK	3.0	2.0	1.5	<b>2.2</b>
ARKABUTLA WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF TUNICA	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
BACK ACRES	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	TUNICA CO UTL DST-RIVERBEND	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
CITY OF SENATOBIA	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>	<b>UNION</b>				
COTTONVILLE-SAVAGE W/A	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>	ALPINE WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	1.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
CRESTFIELD WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	BETHLEHEM WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
EAST TATE ELEMENTARY	2.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>	BLUE SPRINGS W/A #1	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
INDEPENDENCE HIGH SCHOOL	2.0	2.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>	BLUE SPRINGS W/A #2-ELLISTOWN	2.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.7</b>
LOOXAHOMA WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>	CITY OF NEW ALBANY	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
OAKDALE ESTATES & LAKE SUENTE	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	HWY 30 WEST WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
SAM D MINOR-HEAD START	3.0	1.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>	INGOMAR WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
SENATOBIA LAKES ESTATES, INC	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>	KAYE HOME FURNISHINGS	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
STRAYHORN W/A-CROCKETT	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	KEOWNVILLE RURAL WATER ASSN	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
STRAYHORN W/A-TRUSLOW	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	LAKE ARROWHEAD	3.0	5.0	2.5	<b>3.5</b>
TOWN OF COLDWATER	3.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	MASTER-BILT PRODUCTS	3.0	4.0	N.A	<b>3.5</b>
TYRO HEAD START	3.0	1.0	N.A	<b>2.0</b>	MUD CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION #4	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
<b>TIPPAH</b>					NORTH HAVEN WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
BLUE MOUNTAIN COLLEGE	4.0	4.0	N.A	<b>4.0</b>	TOWN OF MYRTLE	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>
CHALYBEATE WATER ASSN #1	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	WALLERVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
CITY OF RIPLEY	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>					
DUMAS-PINE GROVE WATER ASSN	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>					
LAKE MOHAWK ESTATES WATER SYSM	2.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>					
MITCHELL WATER ASSOCIATION #1	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>					
SHADY GROVE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>					
SPOUT SPRINGS W/A #1	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>					
SPOUT SPRINGS W/A #2	3.0	2.0	1.0	<b>2.0</b>					
THREE FORKS WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>					
TIPLERSVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>					
TOWN OF BLUE MOUNTAIN	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>					
TOWN OF FALKNER	2.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>					
TOWN OF WALNUT	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>					

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>WALTHALL</b>					<b>WAYNE</b>				
DEXTER WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.0</b>	BUCKATUNNA WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
IMPROVE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	CITY OF WAYNESBORO	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
LEXIE WATER ASSOCIATION, INC.	5.0	2.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	CLARA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>
MAGEE'S CREEK W/A-NORTH	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>	HIWANEE WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.0	5.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>
TOWN OF TYLERTOWN	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>	HIWANEE WATER ASSOCIATION #2	2.0	5.0	2.0	<b>3.0</b>
<b>WARREN</b>					SOUTHWEST WAYNE WATER ASSN	5.0	4.0	3.0	<b>4.0</b>
CITY OF VICKSBURG	5.0	3.0	2.0	<b>3.3</b>	WHISTLER WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
CULKIN WATER DIST	3.0	5.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	<b>WEBSTER</b>				
EAGLE LAKE WATER DISTRICT	3.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>	CADARETTA WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>
FISHER FERRY WATER DISTRICT	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>	CITY OF EUPORA	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
HILLDALE WATER DISTRICT	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>	CUMBERLAND WATER ASSN #1	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	CUMBERLAND WATER ASSN #2	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
YOKENA-JEFF DAVIS WATER DEPT	5.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.3</b>	DANCY WATER ASSOCIATION, INC.	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
<b>WASHINGTON</b>					MANTEE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
BLACK BAYOU WATER ASSN.	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	MT ZION WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>
CITY OF GREENVILLE	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	SAPA WATER SYSTEM	2.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>
CITY OF GREENVILLE (AIRBASE)	4.0	4.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>	SAVANNAH WATER ASSOCIATION #1	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
CITY OF HOLLANDALE	2.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.0</b>	SPRING VALLEY WATER ASSN	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
CITY OF LELAND	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOMNOLEN WATER ASSN, INC	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
CUMMINGS TRAILER PARK	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	TOWN OF MATHISTON	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
DARLOVE-MURPHY WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	WEBSTER CENTER WATER ASSN	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
DELTA BRANCH EXPERIMENT STA	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	<b>WILKINSON</b>				
DELTA VILLAGE	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	BAY RIDGE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
ELIZABETH WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>	BLEAKHOUSE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	5.0	5.0	<b>5.0</b>
GLEN ALLAN WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	BUFFALO WATER ASSOCIATION	1.0	1.0	2.0	<b>1.3</b>
GOLDING ACRES WATER ASSN	3.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.3</b>	OLD RIVER WATER ASSN	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
HIGHLAND TRAILER PARK, INC.	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	SOUTH CENTREVILLE W/A	5.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
LAKE JACKSON WATER ASSN	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>	TOWN OF CENTREVILLE	3.0	1.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
MULLEN TRAILER PARK	2.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	TOWN OF WOODVILLE	3.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>
PRODUCERS RICE MILL, INC	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>	WILKINSON CO CORRECTIONAL CENTER	3.0	3.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>
RIVERSIDE DEV ASSN, INC	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>	<b>WINSTON</b>				
SWIFTWATER DEV ASSN, INC	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	BOND WATER ASSOCIATION #1	4.0	2.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>
TOWN OF ARCOLA	3.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>	CALVARY WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
TOWN OF METCALFE	4.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	CITY OF LOUISVILLE	5.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
WAYSIDE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>	ELLISON RIDGE WATER ASSN	2.0	0.0	3.0	<b>1.7</b>
WINTERVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	0.0	2.0	<b>2.0</b>	HIGHPOINT WATER ASSOCIATION #1	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>
					HIGHPOINT WATER ASSOCIATION #2	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>
					LIBERTY-PLATTSBURG W/A #2	4.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>
					NANIH-WAIYA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
					NORTHEAST WINSONT WATER ASSN	4.0	5.0	5.0	<b>4.7</b>
					PUGH'S MILL WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	4.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
					SOUTHEAST NOXAPATER WATER ASSN	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>
					TOWN OF NOXAPATER	4.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
					WHITE HALL WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.7</b>

# Mississippi State Department of Health - Division of Water Supply

July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

Max. Rating = 5.0; T - Technical, M - Managerial, F - Financial, O - Overall, N.A - Not Applicable

Water System	T	M	F	O	Water System	T	M	F	O
<b>YALOBUSHA</b>									
BILLY'S CREEK RURAL W/A	5.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.3</b>					
CITY OF WATER VALLEY	4.0	3.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>					
CYPRESS CREEK RURAL WTR ASSN	3.0	3.0	5.0	<b>3.7</b>					
EAST END WATER ASSOCIATION	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>					
ENID LAKE ESTATES	2.0	2.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>					
JEFF DAVIS W/A INC	5.0	3.0	4.0	<b>4.0</b>					
O'TUCKOLOFA WATER ASSOCIATION	5.0	2.0	3.0	<b>3.3</b>					
TILLATOBA WATER ASSOCIATION	2.0	2.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>					
TOWN OF COFFEEVILLE	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					
TOWN OF OAKLAND	3.0	3.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>					
TRI-LAKES WATER ASSN-CENTRAL	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>					
TRI-LAKES WATER ASSN-EAST	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>					
TRI-LAKES WATER ASSN-WEST	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>					
YALOBUSHA WATER/SEWER DIST #1	4.0	1.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>					
YALOBUSHA WATER/SEWER DIST #2	4.0	1.0	5.0	<b>3.3</b>					
<b>YAZOO</b>									
CASEY JONES WATER ASSN.	4.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					
CENTRAL YAZOO #1 FLETCHERS CH.	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>					
CENTRAL YAZOO #2	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					
CENTRAL YAZOO #3 MECHANICSBURG	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					
CENTRAL YAZOO #4-BENTON	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					
CENTRAL YAZOO W/A #5	3.0	3.0	4.0	<b>3.3</b>					
CITY OF YAZOO CITY	4.0	4.0	3.0	<b>3.7</b>					
EAST YAZOO WATER ASSN	4.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>					
HILTON HEIGHTS WATER ASSN #1	3.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>					
HILTON HEIGHTS WATER ASSN #2	3.0	1.0	4.0	<b>2.7</b>					
HOLLY BLUFF WATERWORKS, INC.	4.0	3.0	5.0	<b>4.0</b>					
LAKE CITY WATER ASSN-EAST	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>					
LAKE CITY WATER ASSN-WEST	3.0	2.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>					
MIDWAY W/A #1	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>					
MIDWAY W/A #2	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>					
MIDWAY W/A #3	4.0	1.0	4.0	<b>3.0</b>					
MISSISSIPPI CHEMICAL CORP	4.0	2.0	N.A	<b>3.0</b>					
RENSHAW WATER ASSOCIATION	4.0	2.0	2.0	<b>2.7</b>					
TOWN OF BENTONIA	3.0	1.0	3.0	<b>2.3</b>					
TOWN OF EDEN	3.0	1.0	1.0	<b>1.7</b>					
TOWN OF SATARTIA	3.0	0.0	1.0	<b>1.3</b>					